

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADAPTIX, INC., Plaintiff, v. MOTOROLA MOBILITY LLC, <i>et al</i> , Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01774 PSG CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER (Re: Docket No. 109)
--	--

ADAPTIX, INC., Plaintiff, v. APPLE INC, <i>et al</i> , Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01776 PSG CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER (Re: Docket No. 144)
--	--

ADAPTIX, INC., Plaintiff, v. APPLE INC., <i>et al</i> , Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01777 PSG CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER (Re: Docket No. 143)
---	--

1 2 3 4 5	ADAPTIX, INC., Plaintiff, v. AT&T MOBILITY LLC, <i>et al</i> , Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01778 PSG CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER (Re: Docket No. 150)
6 7 8 9 10 11 12	ADAPTIX, INC., Plaintiff, v. CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON WIRELESS, HTC CORPORATION, and HTC AMERICA, INC., Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-01844 PSG CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER (Re: Docket No. 134)
13 14 15 16 17 18	ADAPTIX, INC., Plaintiff, v. APPLE INC., <i>et al</i> , Defendants.	Case No. 5:13-cv-02023 PSG CLAIM CONSTRUCTION ORDER (Re: Docket No. 125)

19 In this patent infringement suit, Adaptix, Inc. alleges that Motorola Mobility, L.L.C, Apple,
20 Inc., AT&T Mobility L.L.C, and Cellco Partnership *d/b/a* Verizon Wireless infringes U.S. Patent
21 No. 6,947,748 and U.S. Patent No. 7,454,212. Yesterday and today, the court held a tutorial and
22 claim construction hearing. The court's constructions are as follows:

23 CLAIM TERM	CONSTRUCTION
24 "Select[ing] a set of candidate subcarriers" 25 '748 Patent: Claims 6, 8, 19, 21 26 '212 Patent: Claim 1, 18	"Selecting" = "Choosing." All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning
27 "Subcarriers [of/from] the set of 28 subcarriers selected by the [] base station"	"Subcarriers that the base station has chosen from the set of

<p>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28</p>	<p>'748 Patent: Claims 6, 8, 19, 21 '212 Patent: Claim 1, 18</p> <p>"SINR Value"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claim 1, 19</p> <p>"Index indication of a candidate cluster with it(s) ((SINR) value)"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claims 6, 19</p> <p>"Arbitrarily order[ed/ing]"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claims 6, 19 '212 Patent: Claims 13, 28</p> <p>"A system employing orthogonal frequency division multiple access (OFDMA)"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claims 6, 8 '212 Patent: Claim 1</p> <p>"Subcarrier allocation for OFDMA"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claim 11</p> <p>"OFDMA subcarriers"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claims 11, 19, 21 '212 Patent: Claim 18</p> <p>"intra-cell traffic load balancing"</p> <p>'748 Patent: Claim 11</p>	<p>candidate subcarriers selected by the subscriber"</p> <p>"Calculation based on the Signal-to-Interference-plus-Noise Ratios of the cluster's subcarriers"</p> <p>"Identifier (ID) of a chosen candidate cluster of subcarriers with its SINR value."</p> <p>"Order[ed/ing] in a manner not previously defined"</p> <p>"OFDMA": orthogonal frequency division multiple access</p> <p>All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning</p> <p>"OFDMA": orthogonal frequency division multiple access</p> <p>All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning</p> <p>"OFDMA": orthogonal frequency division multiple access;</p> <p>All other terms: plain and ordinary meaning</p> <p>"balancing cluster usage within a cell of a base station"</p>
---	---	--

1 The parties should rest assured that the court arrived at these constructions with a full
2 appreciation of not only the relevant intrinsic and extrinsic evidence, but also the Federal Circuit's
3 teachings in *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*¹ and its progeny. So that the parties may pursue whatever
4 recourse they believe is necessary, a complete opinion will issue before entry of any judgment.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: December 19, 2013

7
8 
9 PAUL S. GREWAL
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 ¹ 415 F.3d 1303, 1312-15 (Fed. Cir. 2005).